

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Sharon Schronce,

PLAINTIFF

v.

Commissioner of Social Security
Administration,

DEFENDANT

Case No. 8:20-3586-TLW

Order

This social security matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) filed by the Magistrate Judge to whom this case was assigned. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends affirming the Commissioner's decision denying Plaintiff's claim for disability insurance benefits. ECF No. 14 at 21. No objections to the Report were filed. This matter is now ripe for decision.

The Court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in the Report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. However, in the absence of objections, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a case, "a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident*

Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

The record reflects, as MJ Austin discussed in the Report, ECF No. 14, the asserted physical impairments of the claimant, including the reasons that she concluded the ALJ's determination of not disabled is supported by substantial evidence. The Magistrate Judge sets forth the ALJ's full analysis in the Report. *See* ECF No. 14, p. 14-18. Plaintiff argues the ALJ failed to properly evaluate the medical opinions of Dr. Korn. ECF No. 10 at 21. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge noted that Plaintiff only saw Dr. Korn on one occasion and had no prior treatment relationship with Plaintiff. Further, the Magistrate Judge discusses why she does not find Plaintiff's arguments persuasive and that she concludes the ALJ found the medical consultant's opinions consistent with the objective medical evidence. The Magistrate Judge outlines why she concludes the ALJ properly explained his reasons and was on "firm ground" in finding Dr. Korn's opinions unpersuasive. *See* ECF No. 14 at 20. The ALJ states the plaintiff "stopped working due to back pain." *Id.* The Magistrate Judge points out that other than one medical visit when Plaintiff complained that "her toes and feet were painful [R. 546], Plaintiff does not point to any evidence in the four years prior to Dr. Korn's examination of complaining to a medical provider of lower back pain of any sort that would prevent her from sitting for more than a few minutes without getting up and moving around." *Id.* Accordingly, the Magistrate Judge concluded that substantial evidence supports the ALJ's decision.

The Court has carefully reviewed the Report. Having found no clear error on the face of the record, the Report is **ACCEPTED** and the Commissioner's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten

Terry L. Wooten

Senior United States District Judge

February 15, 2022
Columbia, South Carolina